



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,430	04/10/2006	Paulus Cornelis Duineveld	92781-253566	3725
44920	7590	07/02/2009		
Venable LLP Raymond J. Ho 575 7th Street NW Washington, DC 20004-1601			EXAMINER RALEIGH, DONALD L.	
			ART UNIT 2879	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/02/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/575,430

Applicant(s)

DUINEVELD ET AL.

Examiner

DONALD L. RALEIGH

Art Unit

2879

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Peter J Macchiarolo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments of June 2, 2009 with respect to Claim 1 are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Sirringhaus does not teach that the microcontact printing method can be used to form any layer between pixels. Examiner disagrees: Sirringhaus uses microcontact printing to form a hydrophobic layer. A hydrophobic layer is provided by Kuwabara between pixels. It would be obvious to try microcontact printing to form the hydrophobic layer as taught by Sirringhaus between the pixels of Kuwabara.

Applicant argues that the Kuwabara device is an OLED and the Sirringhaus method is a polymer TFT device and can't be combined. Examiner disagrees; the devices are not being combined. The method of Sirringhaus can certainly be used in the OLED of Kuwabara because OLED's use organic polymers and the Kuwabara OLED is also an active matrix OLED which uses TFTs.

Applicant argues that the ink droplets of Sirringhaus are not equivalent to the drops of the present application, whether they are or not is irrelevant. The method of depositing the electroluminescent layer is not claimed in claim 1, it is a device claim. It could be printed by any suitable method. The characteristics of the droplets are not claimed. The fact remains that a hydrophobic layer printed between pixels will at least partially retain drops formed in adjacent regions.

Applicant argues that the thin polyimide layer of Sirringhaus is not equivalent to the microcontact printed hydrophobic layer. It is not equivalent to the SAM layer of the present application. However, Sirringhaus uses the microcontact printing process to expose portions of a hydrophobic region (on the SAM) to create a hydrophobic surface layer. Claim 1 requires a hydrophobic layer and the microcontact process of Sirringhaus using SAMS creates a hydrophobic layer.